

While in no way reflecting upon the accuracy of Mr. Cory's work we should have preferred rating all of these, no doubt perfectly natural divisions, as subgenera.

Our contention is that with the present rapid increase of generic names our nomenclature is being rendered more and more unintelligible. While the separation of any group into subdivisions indicating its phylogenetic development is most praiseworthy, why inject this into the *names* of the species involved, when it can be indicated just as well by the use of subgenera, leaving the nomenclature undisturbed? Here we have fifty-seven species or subspecies which most ornithologists with some knowledge of neotropical birds would recognize under the name *Siptornis*, but fifty-six of them now appear under names that are unknown to the vast majority and unless some vernacular name or synonym is appended we should have trouble in finding out what an author, who used them, was writing about. Mr. Cory has adopted a praiseworthy plan of trying to preserve the name *Siptornis* in the new names which he has coined but this is not often attempted and too often names of similar etymology apply to entirely unrelated groups.

This comment as has already been said is not directed against Mr. Cory but against a general practice the merits of which should be very carefully considered by present day systematic ornithologists.— W. S.

**Chapman on New South American Birds.**<sup>1</sup>— Students of the neotropical avifauna will be pleased to learn, from the appearance of this paper, that Dr. Chapman has completed his service in the American Red Cross and is back again at his studies of the rich South American material obtained by various expeditions sent out by the American Museum of Natural History, in the years preceding America's entry into the great war. The fifteen forms here described as new are as follows: *Microsittace ferrugineus minor* (p. 323), Corral, Chile; *Upucerthia dunetoria hallinani* (p. 324), Tofo, Chile; *U. dabbenei* (p. 325) Tafi del Valle, Argentina; *Cinclodes fuscus tucumanus* (p. 326), same locality; *Leptasthenura punctigula* (p. 327), Sarmiento, Argentina; *L. andicola peruvianus* (p. 327), La Raya, Peru; *Siptornis urubambensis* (p. 328) Machu Picchu, Peru; *S. punensis rufala* (p. 328), Tafi del Valle, Argentina; *Pseudochloris uropygialis connectens* (p. 329), La Raya, Peru; *P. olivascens sordida* (p. 330), Ticara, Argentina; *Atlapetes canigenis* (p. 330), Torontoy, Peru; *Diglossa mystacalis albilinea* (p. 331) Machu Picchu, Peru; *Oreomanes binghami* (p. 331), same locality; *Tangara cyaneicollis gularis* (p. 332) Candamo, S. E. Peru; *Amblycercus holosericeus australis* (p. 333), Incachaca, Bolivia.

They are described with the author's characteristic care and detail with frequent comparison with related forms.— W. S.

---

<sup>1</sup> Descriptions of Proposed New Birds from Peru, Bolivia, Argentina, and Chile. By Frank M. Chapman. Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., Vol. XLI, Art. V, pp. 323-333. September 1, 1919.